

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute the attached 50 sheets of replacement drawings depicting Figures 1-72
for the drawings originally filed.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-44 stand rejected in the outstanding Official Action. Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 23, 25, 27 and 28 have been amended and therefore claims 1-44 remain in this application.

Applicants have prepared and submitted herewith formal drawings responsive to the allegation that the originally submitted drawings are informal. Applicants enclose the appropriate replacement drawings and request their entry into this application. This submission obviates any further objection to the drawings.

The specification is objected to as lacking the heading "DETAILED DESCRIPTION." Applicants have amended the specification to insert the heading "DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EMBODIMENTS." This amendment is believed to obviate any further objections to the specification.

Claims 1, 4, 23, 25 and 28 are objected to as including various informalities. It is noted that these informalities occurred in the scanning of claims prior to the preparation of the Preliminary Amendment in this case, and Applicants' current amendment includes correction of each of these occurrences as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's consideration and notation of these errors is very much appreciated.

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 (first paragraph) as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner objects that the function of "a second mapping module" is inconsistent with the disclosure. Applicants have amended the phrase to read "second mapping unit" clarifying that the second mapping unit is part of the mapping module and not a second cross-triggering interface module. Thus, in Applicants' claim, there are two mapping units and a first mapping unit is described in detail in Figure 10, whereas the

mapping unit is described in detail in Figure 20. This amendment in the claims is believed to obviate any further objection to claim 1.

Claim 25 is rejected, with the objection to the phrase "supplying said retrieved diagnostic event data to said associated processing device." This statement is believed to be consistent with Applicants' specification, since the second mapping unit of the cross-triggering interface module (illustrated in detail in Figure 20) is operable to control events occurring on other cores that are notified to the core associated with the particular cross-trigger interface to which the configuration registers belong (see Applicants' specification, page 28, for a detailed description). However, Applicants have modified claim 25 to perhaps more clearly specify the method steps and the actions taken during each method step and therefore, claim 25 is believed to be fully consistent with Applicants' specification. Therefore, any further rejection to claim 25 based upon §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite. The Examiner suggests that it is uncertain as to whether the "first mapped diagnostic event signal" is a reference to the diagnostic event signal previously recited. Applicants confirm that it is and the phrase "first mapped diagnostic event signal" has been amended to merely reference the "diagnostic event signal" which has ample antecedent basis. The Examiner also suggests that the "second mapping module" may be indefinite, and Applicant, as has previously been noted, has amended this to read a "second mapping unit" thereby obviating any further objection to claim 1.

The Examiner's suggested correction to claim 3 changing the dependency from claim 1 to claim 2 has been adopted in this Amendment. Additionally, claim 25, as noted above, has been

amended to provide method steps which more closely correspond to features of the independent apparatus claim 1. These amendments, along with other clarifying amendments to claim 25, are believed to obviate any further objection to that claim.

The Examiner's objection to claim 27 and his proposed change in dependency from claim 25 to claim 26 has been adopted in the above amendment.

In view of the amendments to claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 23, 25, 27 and 28 and the above discussion, it is submitted that claims 1-44 meet all requirements of 35 USC §112 (first and second paragraphs) and any further rejection thereunder is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's consideration of these claims and the fact that no prior art has been cited against these claims is very much appreciated.

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Official Action, it is submitted that claims 1-44 are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. In the event the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative.

AIRAUD et al
Appl. No. 10/633,363
June 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: 

Stanley C. Spooner
Reg. No. 27,393

SCS:kmm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100